

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/051,820	WU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	David Silver	2128	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) David Silver. (3) James Blanchette.  
 (2) Kamini Shah (Supervisor). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Walters.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants had explained their position in that they believe link status was not functionally equivalent to pipe flow. Upon Examiner's explanation of why they were taken to be identical Applicants presented their position stating that even if link status and pipe flow were identical, pipe flow within the Applicants was not taken as an input, but rather as an output. Applicants were made aware that the claim, as recited, reference was not taken as an input, but rather as an output. Applicants were made aware that the claim, as recited, do necessitate that the link status / pipe flow is only used as an input.

Applicants are thanked for their time in discussing and helping clarify their position.